



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,613	12/17/2001	Patrick Baudisch	132954	5897
65575 7590 10/03/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
RICHER, AARON M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,613

Applicant(s)

BAUDISCH, PATRICK

Examiner

AARON M. RICHER

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. As to claims 1, 11, and 21, applicant argues that the Trueblood reference does not display a contiguous image over multiple displays. While it is understood by examiner that such a contiguous display would be desirable to an air traffic controller using the Trueblood invention, examiner agrees that there is nothing in Trueblood that actually states that the air space is partitioned into areas that are contiguous with one another. The display terminals "depict the total air space", but do not inherently do it in a contiguous manner, and so applicant's arguments with respect to this portion of the rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Trueblood (U.S. Patent 5,748,189) in view of Odryna (U.S. Patent 6,333,750).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-18, and 21-25 are rejected under are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trueblood (U.S. Patent 5,748,189) in view of Odryna (U.S. Patent 6,333,750)

4. As to claims 1, 11, and 22, Trueblood discloses a display comprising:

at least two display devices (fig. 5, elements 62 and 64), each display device having a display area with a given display resolution wherein the display resolution of at least one display area is different from the display resolution of at least one other display area (col. 8, lines 5-11; displays with different resolutions are disclosed), a boundary wherein the boundary of each display area is at least partially contiguous with the boundary of at least one other display area (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being contiguous with each other), and an associated image processor for providing image information data (fig. 5; elements 66 and 68; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 11; each screen has its own image processor), and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on one of the at least two display areas is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on at least one other of the at least two display areas (col. 8, lines 5-11; the displays and graphics cards use different resolutions);

Trueblood discloses an air traffic control display (col. 1, lines 29-44), suggesting that the airspace would appear substantially continuous if the coordinates are mapped the way they are shown in fig. 4, but does not explicitly disclose that the airspace is mapped continuously. Trueblood therefore fails to disclose the display devices being so constructed and arranged such that when a single image is displayed across the at least two display areas using image information data received from the associate image processors, the resulting displayed image is perceived as substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image, and also an image replicator configured to generate at least two different scale factors to scale the image information data displayed on

corresponding ones of the at least two display devices, wherein the image information data is scaled by the at least two different scale factors for display on corresponding ones of the at least two display devices .

Odryna, however, discloses, a number of substantially contiguous display devices (see fig. 2 and 3) that display a continuous image (col. 6, lines 22-40; note that in addition to the non-contiguous portions in fig. 1a, continuous portions are displayed in fig. 1b-1c). In addition, Odryna discloses a scaler to scale the data for an appropriate resolution for each display device (col. 20, line 52-col. 21, line 5). It is also noted that Odryna discloses that the display devices may have different resolutions (col. 2, lines 10-26). The motivation for this is that contiguous monitors showing a continuous image allow a less costly display than having one large monitor showing it (col. 1, lines 29-40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood to display a continuous image and scale appropriately for each display in order to allow a less costly display as taught by Odryna.

5. As to claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 23, and 24, Trueblood does not disclose using an LCD display or a projector/projection surface. However, official notice has been taken of the fact that these display devices are very well-known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood to utilize an LCD display or projector/projection surface in order to increase compatibility with modern display systems.

6. As to claim 4, Trueblood discloses a display wherein first and second boundaries are at least partially contiguous (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being contiguous with each other).
7. As to claims 5 and 25, Trueblood discloses a display wherein one display area is adjacent to another display area (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being adjacent to each other)
8. As to claim 7, Trueblood discloses a third display device (fig. 4) having a third display area with third display resolution, wherein the third display resolution is different from at least one of the first display resolution and the second display resolution (col. 8, lines 5-11; col. 11, lines 42-56; a third display with different resolution is disclosed), and a third boundary (fig. 4).
9. As to claim 16, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are two display areas (fig. 5).
10. As to claim 17, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are 3 display areas, a first display area, a second display area, and a third display area (fig. 4; col. 11, lines 42-56)
11. As to claim 18, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are 5 display areas (fig. 4).
12. As to claim 21, Trueblood discloses second and third display areas spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed therebetween (fig. 4; if it is assumed that screen 3 is the first display, screen 1 is the second display, and screen 4 is the third

display, then a portion of the first display- screen 3 is in between the second- screen 1 and the third- screen 4).

13. Claims 6, 8-10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trueblood in view of Odryna and further in view of Gennetten (U.S. Patent 6,812,907).

14. As to claims 6, 14, 26, and 27, neither Trueblood nor Odryna discloses a display that surrounds another display. Gennetten, however, discloses a display wherein the first display area is surrounded by the second display area (figs. 2 and 3). Gennetten also discloses two separate display devices (col. 9, lines 16-29) that are contiguous (figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5), such that a single image is continuous across the two display areas (col. 2, lines 21-33; large images are displayed across both displays continuously). The motivation for this arrangement is to enable detailed view of an image without unnecessarily wasting power, since a surrounding screen can be turned off (col. 1, line 61-col. 2, line 19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood and Odryna to display an image continuously over one device that surrounds another in order to enable detailed view of that image, but also save power as taught by Gennetten.

15. As to claims 8, 10, 15, and 19, Trueblood discloses at least 3 display areas as in fig. 4. Gennetten further discloses a display wherein the first display area fully surrounds the second display area as described in the rejection to claim 6. The teachings of Gennetten can be equivalently applied to a three display system, creating a three display system in which two displays are surrounded by another display, and in

which a display is surrounded by a display which is surrounded by another display.

Motivation for this combination can be found in the rejection to claim 6.

16. As to claim 9, Trueblood discloses second and third display areas spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed therebetween (fig. 4; if it is assumed that screen 3 is the first display, screen 1 is the second display, and screen 4 is the third display, then a portion of the first display- screen 3 is in between the second- screen 1 and the third- screen 4).

17. As to claim 20, Trueblood discloses at least 3 display areas, wherein two are spaced apart, as in fig. 4, and in the rejection to claim 9 above. Gennetten further discloses a display wherein the first display area fully surrounds the second display area as described in the rejection to claim 6. The teachings of Gennetten can be equivalently applied to a three display system, creating a three display system in which two surrounded display areas are spaced apart. Motivation for this combination can be found in the rejection to claim 6.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON M. RICHER whose telephone number is (571)272-7790. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron M Richer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628
9/28/08